

**City of Binghamton**  
**Commission on Architecture and Urban Design**  
**30 April 2013**  
**Minutes**

**DRAFT**

**Date:** 30 April 2013  
**Location:** PHCD Conference Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor City Hall  
**Present:** Ruth Levy – Commissioner, Chair  
Sean Massey – Commissioner, Vice-Chair  
Mike Haas – Commissioner  
Peter Klosky – Commissioner  
John Darrow – Commissioner  
H. Peter L’Orange – Historic Preservation Planner  
Joel Boyd – Economic Development  
Tom Costello – Building and Construction/Code Enforcement  
Councilman Matzo – 6<sup>th</sup> District  
Lora Zier – Broome County Planning

Ms. Levy called the meeting to order at approximately 12:05 PM.

The minutes from the 26 March 2013 meeting were reviewed. There were two small typos for correction. Mr. Darrow made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0.

**Items Heard:**

**83 Court Street – Façade:** [Mr. Massey arrived as this case started.] The Applicant presented this case. The Applicant was seeking a reauthorization of a previously approved application (CAUD 2009-35). Normally, an approval can only be extended or reauthorized in the 12 month period during which the approval is active. The Applicant was requesting an exception to this, due to the extremely unusual circumstances related to the fire at the site. The Commission agreed that this was reasonable. There was some general discussion of the façade designs. Mr. Massey made a motion to reauthorize the pervious approval, with the conditions that the Applicant get the necessary approvals for any paint colors, awnings, and/or signage as appropriate; it was seconded by Mr. Darrow. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the reauthorization was APPROVED with conditions.

**41-43 Court Street and 153-157 Washington Street – Signage and Lighting:** Mr. Massey recused himself from this case to avoid any conflict of interest. The Applicants presented this case. The Applicants proposed to install a total on two (2) wall signs: one on Court Street and one on Washington Street. As the first floors of the properties are combined into one business space, the Applicants will need an area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals; the Applicants will also need area variances for the size of the wall signs. The Commission stated that they supported the variance requests. There was some discussion of the size of the lettering on

the sign; Mr. Klosky was concerned that the lettering was too tall, making the sign appear oddly proportioned. It was recommended that the lettering be reduced from 24 inches tall to 20 inches tall; the Applicant were agreeable to this. Mr. Haas made a motion to approve the signs and lighting as proposed, with the condition that the lettering be reduced from 24 inches tall to 20 inches tall; it was seconded by Mr. Darrow. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-1, with Mr. Massey abstaining; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

**201 State Street – Façade:** This case had been tabled at the 26 April 2013 CAUD meeting. The Applicant presented this case. The Applicant proposes to redesign the façades of the building as part of the reoccupation of the building as a Tavern/Night-club on the first floor and residential on the upper floors. There was a detailed discussion of the proposed design. Mr. Darrow made a motion to approve the redesign of the façades as presented with the following conditions: (1) that the Applicants use taller, narrower windows on the Southern façade, more in keeping with the rest of the building; (2) that the Applicant install windows on the rear of the building, consistent with the size and placement of the windows on the front façade, subject to the windows meeting the NYS Building Code; and (3) that the Applicant use a deeper, darker red brick on the front façade; and further that is the recommendation of the Commission that the Applicant consider the installation of an awning(s) on the front façade, to be approved by the Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Massey. There was no further discussion. The motion carried 5-0-0; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

**7 Alice Street – Determination of Significance for Demolition:** The Applicant and their representatives presented this case. The Applicant was proposing to demolish this building, saying that it has been damaged repeatedly by flooding. There was some discussion of the history of the building, and the Applicant's plans for the site. Mr. Darrow made a motion to issue a Determination of No Historical Significance for the property; it was seconded by Mr. Klosky. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the Commission issued a DETERMINATION OF NO HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

**110 Main Street – Awning Sign:** [Mr. Darrow recused himself due to past interactions related to this property.] Staff presented this case. The Applicant proposed to install a vinyl stick-on signage appliqué over the existing awning frame and material. The Commission expressed concern that the proposed treatment would not be appropriate for a historic building. Various options were discussed. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the sign as proposed on the condition that the existing awning material either be painted to match the appliqué or recovered in the same grey and with the recommendation that the whole awning structure be replaced with a more appropriate design and that the door to the residential portion be painted grey to match the stone work; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. There was no further discussion. The motion carried 4-0-1, with Mr. Darrow abstaining; the awning sign was APPROVED with conditions.

**39 Court Street – Signage:** Staff presented this case. The Applicant had installed a new face on an existing panel box sign without permit or Commission review. The Commission discussed the sign and asked Staff to look into whether the sign box originally had a permit or approval. Pending this research, Mr. Massey made a motion to table the case; it was seconded by Mr. Darrow. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the case was TABLED.

Mr. Massey then made a motion to recall the case for 110 Main Street; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. Mr. Darrow recused himself again. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-1, with Mr. Darrow abstaining; the case was recalled.

Mr. Massey then made a motion to table the case for 110 Main Street, pending research into whether the existing awning ever received a valid building/sign permit; it was seconded by Mr. Klosky. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-1, with Mr. Darrow still abstaining; the case was TABLED.

**15 Hawley Street – Mechanical Enclosure:** Staff presented the revised pictures and proposed designs for the mechanical enclosure. There was general consensus that the enclosure as it was designed and painted as installed was the best option. Mr. Darrow made a motion to approve the enclosure as installed; it was seconded by Mr. Massey. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the project was APPROVED.

#### **Other Business**

- Staff provided the Commission some information on proposed updates to the City's Zoning Code and other legislative efforts.

There was no further business.

Mr. Darrow made a motion to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Mr. Massey. The motion carried 5-0-0. The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:55 PM.

The next meeting of the Commission on Architecture and Urban Design is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, 29 May 2013.